

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 7, 1911

No. 1

Among efforts to stimulate interest in the Classics, in High Schools, especially in the Middle and the Far West, may be enumerated classical clubs, Roman banquets, Latin games, plays in the original Greek and Latin (though oftener in translations), dramatizations of Vergil, Caesar, Horace, etc. See The Classical Journal, passim, under Current Events; note especially the article Greek Plays in America, by D. D. Hains, 6.24-39 (the paper deals also with Latin plays).

An interesting result is a booklet entitled Two Latin Plays for High-School Students, by Miss Susan Paxson, of the Omaha High School (Ginn and Co., 1911. Pp. xii + 39. 50 cents); the author's purpose is to "give pleasure and be of profit to <those> who have set out on their toilsome journey into the realm of Latin literature". Miss Paxson was led to prepare this book by the profit which she herself, as well as her advanced classes, had found in a book called Dramatizations from Vergil, by Professor F. J. Miller, of the University of Chicago. Professor Miller, in a brief introduction to Miss Paxson's book, commends it as offering "a helpful contribution to the ever-present and vexing problem which the teachers of Latin in the secondary schools are meeting: how can we make this Latin interesting to our pupils?" He is careful to add that the teacher must not seek mere interest, but must invent ways of vitalizing teaching without weakening it.

The two plays are entitled A Roman School (pp. 2-15) and A Roman Wedding (20-36). They are both in prose. Pages 16-17 give suggestions for the costumes and other properties of the first play; 37-39 make similar suggestions concerning the other play.

In A Roman School, Cicero, his brother Quintus, Catiline, M. Antonius, Caesar, Pompey, Clodius, M. Brutus, Hortensius, L. Licinius Lucullus, C. and M. Claudius Marcellus figure as pupils! When the play begins, two boys are playing "odd or even"; two are playing with *nuces*, one with a top, another with a small cart; another is rolling a hoop (an un-Roman touch: see Horace Carm. 3.24.57). With the conversation of three boys who are playing ball the play proper begins (one of the ball-players is M. Cicero, who, according to Becker-Göll, Gallus 3.170, was one of the few Romans who did not employ this form of exercise; they refer to Pro Archia 13 as

proof. I have, however, long had doubts of the genuineness of *quantum pilae* in this passage; I am surprised that no editor has called attention to the strangeness of these words after *quantum denique alveolo*). Presently the magister enters and calls the roll. Next there is a lesson in 'parsing', in which M. Cicero and Hortensius shine. Catiline, who comes in late, is berated and then flogged; Pompey cries when called on but is coaxed into a good recitation by a *placenta*. For coming in late Appius Claudius is made to recite Mica, mica, parva stella, etc. Other pupils volunteer to recite; they present Latin versions of John, John (sic!), the piper's son, Jack and Jill. Hortensius recites a mongrel version, Iacobulus Horner Sedebat in corner, etc. Neither for this piece nor for the two page-skit (13-15) beginning with The nox was lit by light of luna does the author apologize, though on page 9 she makes apology for a "most obvious anachronism" because the boys sing a Latin version of Onward, Christian Soldiers! Next information about Gaul is given by the pupils in the words of the De Bello Gallico.

Soon P. Licinius Crassus and A. Licinius Archias enter, to act as judges of an oratorical contest between Caesar and Cicero, arranged several days before. Each contestant sets forth his life's ambitions. Here again there is an un-Roman touch, for Cicero says, Haec mea <semper> ambitio fuit, ut me ad scribendi studium conferam, primum Romae, deinde in aliis urbibus" (11). No Roman in Cicero's time—least of all Cicero himself—would have formulated his ambition in such terms. The author has the Oratio pro Archia in mind, but she has not mastered the speech or the commentaries on it; a reading also of Reid's Academica, editio maior, pages 1-10 (Cicero as man of letters and student of philosophy), would be of service. The judges profess themselves unable to decide, and the boys cast lots for the prize.

In this play, as in the other, the Latin is, on the whole, good. The vocative, however, too often stands first; the praenomen is regularly written out in full. Children using the book will be pleased (I hope) to come on tags of the authors they have read, such as *Quousque tandem*, etc., addressed to Catiline when he comes in late.

A Roman Wedding begins with Cicero declaim-

200

ing behind the scenes parts of his first speech against Catiline. He knocks over a vase, to Terentia's distress: "Iam molestum est", she cries, "oratori nup-sisse". She reads one of a packet of letters and then laments "Quondam litteras amantissimas scripsit; nunc epistolia frigescent. Quodam vas mihi dedit, nunc vas mihi demolitur; quondam fuit maritus, nunc est orator". When Cicero at last enters, she gives him a report from the magister ludi which sets in unfavorable light the performances of their son; the boy has been tardy and absent, and is deficient in various subjects. But to his father's delight the report says he declaims well; he cries "Orator clarissimus olim eris". The boy, who is at home at the time, replies, "Facile est oratorem fieri. Declamatio est facillima". This sounds as if he had been reading modern German opinions of his father's oratory.

Presently L. Piso Frugi and Q. Hortensius enter, and in a very good scene Cicero, much against his will, is induced by Terentia's urgent pleading to betroth his daughter to Piso's son. A false note, however, again creeps in here, for Piso is made to say "*sine dote* (the italics are mine) tuam filiam meo filio posco". Piso and Hortensius withdraw. Terentia sends for Tullia and forces her to consent to the marriage. Piso, his son, and the *signatores* enter, and the formal *sponsio* is made (28-29).

The second scene (32-33) portrays the marriage, the third (34-36) pictures the *deductio*. The archaeological details are sufficiently accurate.

On the whole Miss Paxton is distinctly to be congratulated on her booklet. The second play in particular is well constructed, has many good touches, and ought to prove decidedly instructive wherever carefully performed. C. K.

ADDRESS TO THE TRUSTEES OF AMHERST COLLEGE BY THE CLASS OF 1885

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.129 brief reference was made to an Address submitted to the Trustees of Amherst College by the Class of 1885 of that College. During the summer a pamphlet of 80 pages was published, giving the Address in full, together with comments by various newspapers and periodicals on the propositions made by the Class. Another pamphlet of 16 pages gives The Reply of the Trustees to the Class of Eighteen Eighty-five. Our readers will, no doubt, be glad to have more exact knowledge of the whole matter.

The Address was prepared by a Committee of three, consisting of Mr. E. Parmalee Prentice, a lawyer of New York City, Dr. Ellsworth G. Lancaster, President of Olivet College, and Dr. William G. Thayer, Head Master of St. Mark's School, Southboro, Mass.

The Committee throughout urges the Trustees so to act that Amherst shall "take a distinctive public position as a representative of that individual training and general culture which once was the purpose of all American Colleges". Education, runs the argument, is now too largely technical and in the Universities there is far too little personal contact and influence between teacher and student. The great State Universities take students as they pass from the High Schools and at once offer them technical training as a preparation for some professional or commercial career; these universities threaten the supremacy even of the privately endowed college. Thanks to most generous support by friends and alumni some great privately endowed universities can compete with the state universities, "taking students from high schools and graduating them equipped to pursue a technical occupation".

This scheme leaves no place for such a college as Amherst. The high school fits for the university, and the university for the selected calling. Amherst, on the other hand, demands a preparation not within the tendencies of the high school, and gives a course of training which does not fit for, but, on the other hand, postpones, preparation for a calling.

What, then, is to be the future of Amherst? It is without the means necessary to enable it to..... compete with the great universities in their extended fields..... Is there no distinctive field which Amherst may occupy, no demand for an improvement in the quality of instruction which Amherst may supply?

We believe that there is such a field; that there are public services which Amherst may render; that there are already signs of reaction from present conditions, and that no institution can better lead and give form to this reaction than Amherst College.

The popular appraisal of education is commercial—measuring the value of a training by the income it returns—and if every man stand for himself alone, this appraisal may be right. It is in the relation of the individual to the community, however, that this view of educational training breaks down. "There are in this country", said Professor Nelson of Williams College, "no two wants more pressing than a literature of the first rank and statesmen of the first rank. The two go together. Your great statesmen are bred on literature and the historic achievements of mankind..... Those alone have the right to deal with the destinies of humanity who have learned the laws by which humanity has come to its present heritage".

No literature, said De Tocqueville, ought to be more studied in democratic ages than that of the ancients. This, classical training, modified from time to time by demands of modern scholarship, has always been the Amherst course, and the Class of 1885 urge that the College can and should make its work in this field of distinctive value and public importance; that this can be done by raising the standard of work among faculty and students—by getting together at Amherst the best teachers in the country in our chosen field of work and the most serious and able young men to profit by this course of teaching. These three things are the College—the course of instruction, the men who give the course, and the students who receive it.

Amherst has stood for a liberal or classical education—the old-fashioned course—and for many years there was in this respect no difference between Amherst and other institutions of higher education in this country. The value to the public of this training in making statesmen and leaders of public thought is even now unquestioned. It is a training in civics, in the history of government, in the development and significance of institutions, in the meaning of civilization—in brief, a training for public leadership, not personal equipment for a trade.

"The American college", Dr. Woodrow Wilson said, "has played a unique part in American life. . . . It formed men who brought to their tasks an incomparable morale, a capacity that seemed more than individual, a power touched with high ideals. The college has been the seat of ideals. The liberal training which it sought to impart took no thought of any particular profession or business, but was meant to reflect in its few and simple disciplines the image of life and thought. Men were bred by it to no skill or craft or calling; the discipline to which they were subjected had a more general object. It was meant to prepare them for the whole of life, rather than some particular part of it. The ideals which lay at its heart were the general ideals of conduct, of right living and right thinking, which made them aware of a world moralized by principle, and catholic reflection and just feeling, a world not of interest but of ideas. Such impressions, such challenges to a man's spirit, such intimations of privilege and duty, are not to be found in the work of professional and technical schools. They cannot be".

Very few colleges follow this line now—unfortunately few, for the old ideas were not all wrong—but among the few that can find no substitute in technical training for the ideals of the past Amherst has an honorable place. This is the opportunity of the College, to make it its work to give that sound training which fits men to become public leaders. Institutions and governments have a history, and the best statesmanship is that which meets the future with lessons derived from a profound understanding of what has gone before us. Technical education, which, so far as government is concerned, for the most part teaches devices but not principles, which seems to assert that successful business fits for successful statesmanship, proceeds upon the assumption that retrospect is not wise and that in any difficulty we should consider not how we got there but how we can get out, as if, said Edmund Burke, we should "consult our invention and reject our experience". Here, indeed, is to be found one of the causes of the increasing excitability of American politics. Invention is the parent of Utopias, socialism, radicalism of all kinds. Experience is the parent of improvement, progress, conservatism.

It is perhaps unnecessary for the Committee to say that in any teaching of the experience of the race the sciences have a necessary place. None would advocate adoption of the unchanged classical course of fifty years ago. All would agree that some knowledge of science is part of a liberal education, and should be taught at Amherst—at least so far as to enable her graduates to enter the best professional schools. Notwithstanding all this, however, the day of the classics has not yet gone by. Mr. Charles Francis Adams, a quarter of a century ago a leader in the attack upon the old scheme of education, himself recently said that as an essential part of a college course "I would prescribe one of the classic tongues, Greek or Latin, as a compulsory

study to the day of graduation, the one royal road to a knowledge of all that is finest in letters and art".

Upon the specific question which Mr. Adams presents, or even upon the broad question what at the present time should be the general character of classical training, the Committee makes no suggestions. The point which it is now sought to emphasize is that there is a great field which Amherst may occupy, that this field is nothing less than training in public leadership and broad culture. In this instruction, if Amherst makes its position publicly distinctive and different from that occupied by the great universities, she need fear no competition.

The tendency of modern institutions—if we disregard their distractions—is to make breadwinners, to fit men to earn money. State universities are necessarily of this character, and the influence upon all institutions which compete with them is strong. Size itself almost irresistibly drives this way. Back of this modern movement is the notion recently stated by Professor John M. Gillette, an apostle of vocational training—his very language marked by the modern divorce from classical scholarship—that "The assumption of State education is that its training is necessary for citizenship, that is, to be a valid member of society. But since one can be such only as he is able to function in society, that is, work in society, according to its fundamental nature, and since society is essentially specialized and vocational in constitution, it follows that to make citizens in the best sense is to vocationalize them, make them able to further some dominant social interest".

With Professor Gillette's conception of citizenship in the best sense we need not quarrel. None doubt, and at the present time none need emphasize the fact, that the world needs, and must have, engineers, chemists, electricians, biologists; that technical education and trade education are essential to the work of the world; that the vast development of schools and universities in technical lines has been in response to urgent public necessity. For all this we have no unfavorable criticism. The point to be emphasized is that different institutions may well turn their attention in different directions.

The proposition for which Amherst stands is that preparation for some particular part of life does not make better citizens than, in President Wilson's phrase, preparation for the whole of it; that because a man can "function in society" as a craftsman in some trade or technical work he is not thereby made a better leader; that we have already too much of that statesmanship marked by ability "to further some dominant social interest" and too little of that which is "aware of a world moralized by principle, steadied and cleared of many an evil thing by true and catholic reflection and just feeling, a world not of interests but of ideas". Amherst upholds the proposition that for statesmen, leaders of public thought, for literature, indeed for all work which demands culture and breadth of view, nothing can take the place of the classical education; that the duty of institutions of higher education is not wholly performed when the youth of the country are passed from the high schools to the universities to be "vocationalized", but that there is a most important work to be performed by an institution which stands outside this straight line to pecuniary reward; that there is room for at least one great classical college, and we believe for many such. This is the training which Amherst has given, and if now the college

were publicly and definitely to stand forward as an exponent of classical learning in such modified course as modern scholarship may approve, we believe that, with its history, its deserved reputation, and its present position, it can take the place of leadership in this work. This once done, the College will no longer appeal for support solely to its friends, but would have reason to expect the efficient support of all friends of classical education—that is, of the most conservative, thoughtful, and scholarly persons.

Among such persons the desire for sound classical training is frequently expressed. It was but recently that Professor Trent of Columbia said:

"Perhaps in time certain colleges will be able to emphasize to a greater degree the tried classical discipline and to cease to compete with the technical schools. There is room in this huge country for institutions of every kind, and there are still people who would gladly give their children on old-fashioned education, that is, a discipline that has been tested, under teachers convinced of its merits, and not hampered by the necessity of defending it against colleagues who do not believe in it".

That Amherst should abolish its present course leading to the degree of B.S. will probably not be seriously questioned. This was once, and perhaps not long since, a valuable course, but at the present time, in view of the courses of instruction given at such schools as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sheffield Scientific School, Cornell, and many others, it seems to the Committee that young men who desire scientific instruction make a mistake to come to Amherst. That the degree should represent something less than a thorough scientific course of some character, or be used to permit graduation of those who, for one reason or another, do not fulfil the requirements of the arts degree, probably few would justify. Williams College refuses to grant this degree, and we believe that Amherst should do the same. It is to be supposed that this would reduce the number of students very considerably, but the Committee urge that the change is one which is due to the College itself as well as to its students.

On the other hand, the classical field we believe belongs to Amherst. This is the work in which the College may be made a leader. Of course such a position cannot be taken at once. Time is necessary, and it is necessary that in time the College so regulate its affairs that it shall be enabled to give the training in its chosen field better than any other institution. The method by which all this may be accomplished the Committee believes is involved in changes which should be inaugurated as parts of a single well-matured policy.

First: Our faculty must be composed of the best teachers in the country for our chosen course.

Second: The body of students and the purpose and life of the College must be directed toward excellence in scholarship.

The address then discussed (pp. 13-17) the need of a very decided increase in salaries of professors, etc., if there is to be decided improvement in teaching. Next means of improving the quality of scholarship of the students are considered (19-24).

The Address concludes (p. 25) with the following words:

We there urge upon the Trustees:

(1) That the instruction given at Amherst College

be a modified classical course as the meaning of that term has been described;

(2) That the degree of Bachelor of Science be abolished;

(3) That the College adopt the deliberate policy to devote all its means to the indefinite increase of teachers' salaries;

(4) That the number of students attending the College be limited;

(5) That entrance be permitted only by competitive examination.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS

Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors, translated from the Latin with a Commentary. By Mario Emilio Cosenza. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1910). Pp. xiv + 208. \$1.00.

This will be a welcome addition to the bookshelves of many a classical teacher, whose desire to know the period of the revival of learning is tempered by distance from a large library, or lack of time to seek out the original sources. There are ten of these Letters to (classical) Dead Authors—two to Cicero (*altera mores notat, altera laudat ingenium*: so Petrarch, *Fam.* 24.2), one each to Seneca—who was to Petrarch both Senecas rolled into one—Varro, Quintilian, Livy, Pollio, Horace, Vergil, and Homer. Those to Horace and Vergil are in *asclepiads* and *hexameters* respectively, the rest, of course, in prose. They were composed as a diversion, he tells us in a letter written years afterward: *varietatis studio et amoeno quodam laborum diverticulo* (*Fam.*, l. c.). And again—*Lusi ego cum his magnis ingeniis, temerarie forsitan, sed amanter, sed dolenter, etc.* (*ib.*).

The translation is followed in each case by notes, without which the reader not at home in Petrarch would often grope blindly. These notes contain many translations of parallel or illustrative passages in the correspondence of the poet, or from other writers, classical citations in English, metrical renderings from the Octavia, etc. Finally a brief bibliography points the way to further studies in a field which has many fascinations for the classical scholar.

Petrarch has suffered from the fact that to the multitude he is known only at third or fourth hand in the most accessible books. It is therefore to be hoped that Dr. Cosenza's translation and interpretation of a group of the letters will stimulate many students and teachers of the Classics and of modern literature to read and reread the original. Naturally there is much that no translator can reproduce; not that Petrarch's form was of a classical perfection, but because his style so strangely combined naïveté with rhetorical artifice. And though he preferred the rounded periods of Cicero, the sententiousness of a Seneca or Tacitus often appears, even in the same sentence. Such a style

baffles the best intentions to retain, where possible, the peculiar qualities of the original. One is forced to divide long periods, and unavoidable changes of order may play havoc with the emphasis or logical connection. Other liberties tend to creep in, convenient, but not defensible. Dr. Cosenza has wisely chosen the general method adopted by Giuseppe Fracassetti in his complete Italian translation of Petrarch's letters. Fracassetti and Dr. Cosenza thus give us a free rendering, in which Petrarch is rather interpreted than reproduced. This no doubt best serves the needs and tastes of those for whom the book was designed. The mere Latinist, however, cannot help a protest now and then, where the freedom seems unreasonable, where a good metaphor is displaced by another no better, if as good, or where a Tacitean antithesis is expanded beyond recognition. Of course the tendency to pad is very strong in English, and much must be conceded to the difficulties of the task. It is far easier to find fault than to produce a fairly invulnerable rendering. But laxity of method is all too prevalent in recent work of this kind.

The pitfalls of unmethodical translation may be seen in the following comparison—a passage dealing with the dual supremacy of Cicero and Vergil in prose and verse, each incapable of excelling in the other's field:

(1) Petrarch: *neuter ad utrumque satis erat, illi tuis aequoribus, tu illius impar angustis* (to Cicero, *Fam.* 24. 4, p. 265).

(2) Fracassetti: *nè l'uno nè l'altro avrebbe potuto il doppio incarico sostenere, incapace quegli di reggere alla impetuosa tua vena, incapace tu d'andar franco fra le sue pastoie* (p. 143).

(3) Cosenza: neither of you could serve both purposes; he could not rival thee in thy chosen field, whereas thou couldst not adapt thyself to his measured flow (p. 23).

(4) Develay: *"vous ne pouviez ni l'un ni l'autre suffire à cette double tâche, votre rival étant incapable d'arpenter vos plaines et vous de franchir ses défilés"* (p. 216)—at last a proper respect for the metaphors in an antithesis!

Deference to Fracassetti is probably responsible for the misconception of the opening sentence of the letter to Seneca: *Petitam a tanto viro impetratamque veniam velim, si quid asperius dixerō*, etc. (24.5, p. 268). The *tantus vir* must be the person addressed, Seneca, not Cicero, as Fracassetti, Develay, and Cosenza (p. 43) think. A backward reference in the perfect participle with *velim* in this familiar idiom is impossible. On p. 27 one reads with great surprise these words: "It is as if we had overcome, after a great struggle, the oblivion threatened by the sloth and inactivity of ages." Wondering at this un-Petrarchian optimism, we turn to the original: *veluti ingenti praelio oblivione et ignavia superatis* (p. 267). Obviously the last word agrees with *nobis* understood, and *oblivione et ignavia* are the means. By some oversight Fra-

cassetti has omitted to translate at this point seven lines of the text (p. 145). On p. 43, *Viri illustres, qualium omnis aetas penuriam passa est* (p. 268) is rendered by "O illustrious characters of antiquity. Each succeeding age has suffered your works to remain in great neglect", not at all what *penuria* means. Contrast the terse precision of Develay: *"hommes illustres, dont chaque siècle a éprouvé la rareté"* (p. 289). On page 50 we have "Receive my words in good part, O Seneca, and be calm, for the more impatiently one listens to the truth the more deeply is he wounded by it". The Latin simply says (without gratuitous preamble): *Ut est animus veri impatiens, eo iniuriosius plectitur quo verius* (p. 272; Fracassetti's text omits the necessary comma); i. e. "human nature, being impatient of the truth, is wounded in proportion to the truth of the charge". Here another passage is omitted by F. in his translation (p. 150)—eleven lines of text, containing a lacuna, to which attention should have been called in a note. As it stands the clause "and that the name of that tragedy is *Octavia*" (p. 50) is unintelligible. The passage which immediately follows offers another extreme example of padding: *quam si sequimur, quod ad te attinet, expers tu culpa huius* (p. 272), is rendered by "If we accept the conclusions drawn therefrom, thou wilt be entirely acquitted of having written the tragedy to avenge the burden of thy yoke". A little below there is an unhappy confusion of the thought: *Ita quantum morum demitur infamiae, tantumdem ingenii famae detrahitur*, i. e., as Develay puts it, "Ainsi tout ce que vous gagnez en dignité de caractère, vous le perdez en réputation de talent" (p. 293), is rendered by Dr. Cosenza as "The more inadequate is the attack on infamous conduct, the weaker is the intellectual power of the writer". And the next sentence is equally mystifying: "Indeed, beyond the attack on Nero there is (in my opinion) no other excuse for the writing of that much discussed play". The text reads: *Omnis alioquin excusatio, nisi fallor, famosi carminis nulla est*, which the reviewer would render: "In general there is no excuse whatever for the slanderous play".

In the notes one occasionally wishes the translator had shown more independence, e. g. in his treatment of the *Octavia*, for in spite of the citations from Teuffel (p. 62), the uninitiated reader will still infer that Seneca probably wrote that play. On page 120, *eadem [libertate] adversus ipsum mundi dominum saepe usus* (p. 284), said of Asinius Pollio, Dr. Cosenza explains by a passage in Suetonius's *Iulius*, but it seems more naturally to refer to Pollio's well-known independence towards Augustus.

But it is easy to be censorious, and to forget the pains involved in the production of such a book,

We hope Dr. Cosenza will give us more of his Petrarch studies, and that in his future translations freedom, so commendable in general, may be only the mask, behind which lurk the uncompromising features of rigorous method¹.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

FRANK GARDNER MOORE.

Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. I. The Verb. By Charles E. Bennett. Boston: Allyn and Bacon (1910). Pp. xix + 506. \$4.00.

Almost fifty years have passed since the publication of the last comprehensive work on the syntax of Early Latin—F. W. Holtze's *Syntaxis priscorum scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1861-1862). This was supplemented in 1882, soon after the author's death, by his *Syntaxis fragmentorum scaenicorum poetarum Romanorum qui post Terentium fuerunt adumbratio*, a pamphlet of seventy-eight pages. In fifty years the syntactical monographs devoted to the Latin of the early period have multiplied enormously and scholars have been forced either to use these monographs directly—and they are often difficult to secure—or to be content with the necessarily brief treatments of the early period contained in such general works as Schmalz's *Syntax in I. Mueller's Handbuch*, Volume 2, the new but still incomplete *Historische Grammatik* of Stolz, Landgraf, and others (1894-1908), Volume 3, or the syntactical notes in such standard editions of the early writers as Brix's plays of Plautus (revised by Niemeyer), Dziatzko's Terence (revised by Hauler and Kauer), Vahlen's Ennius, F. Marx's Lucilius, etc. Even the professed treatments of the syntax of single writers, e. g. E. Ballas, *Grammatica Plautina* (1884), Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina* (1892), Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (1907), have dealt with small parts of the subject or have been mere outlines. All scholars, therefore—especially those who have not had ready access to a good library—have long wished for a general work on early Latin syntax which should summarize the labors of specialists during the last half-century, provide a good bibliography, and present a full selection of the material. Professor Bennett is earning the gratitude of Latin scholars by his effort to perform a task the mere labor of which would dismay most men; and this remains true no matter how one may criticize the finished product, for the material is in general richly presented and the bibliography will lead the reader to good monographs.

If the book were a mere summary of the material and results of the countless special works on which it is based, it would be of very great value. But it is no mere summary. Everywhere one finds evi-

dence of independent scrutiny of the facts by a scholar who is himself a specialist in Latin syntax. In fact the personality of the author pervades the book to a degree quite exceptional in a work of this character and lends to it a vigor and a life which render it always interesting whether one agrees or disagrees with the views expressed. Nor has Professor Bennett's critical attitude been limited to an evaluation of the material and results of others. He has himself collected or re-collected material whenever he has failed to find adequate monographs. His work, therefore, often assumes the character of an independent investigation.

In the preface, which occupies but little more than a page, there are some statements which are misleading and need expansion. In his definition of Early Latin Professor Bennett says that Holtze's work ended with Terence. He might at least have alluded to the same scholar's posthumous work the title of which has been given above. Scholars will not quarrel with the later limit, about 100 B. C., set for Early Latin, but it is not true that if the scope of the work had been extended for another quarter of a century, "the additions would have been insignificant—merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists and contemporary inscriptions". If the remains of the language down to 75 B. C.—a date which Professor Bennett himself mentions—had been considered, it would have been necessary to study the Auctor ad Herennium, to say nothing of the earliest orations of Cicero. Specialists will, of course, know this, but it is to be hoped that the book will be used not by specialists alone.

The texts to which Professor Bennett refers in citing his material are not always the best available. The *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum* of Aemilius Baehrens, for example, offers if possible a less reliable text than the other editions of the same editor and is out of print besides. Probably Professor Bennett chose this book for reasons of convenience, but in cases where the fragments of single poets have been well edited in separate form, as in Vahlen's Ennius and Marx's Lucilius, it would have been better to abandon Baehrens. This criticism would have less weight, if care had been taken to correct the text of Baehrens when it is wrong, but a comparison of citations as they appear in the texts of Baehrens and Vahlen or Baehrens and Marx will show that such corrections have not been made with any consistency.

The classification of material, which is summarized in an admirably full and clear table of contents, is as far as possible formal. This is always true of the main rubrics and is applied in as great detail as possible to the subdivisions. Chapter III, for example, is entitled *The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses* (here the classification is formal). The first subdivision is *Conditional Sentences* (the classi-

¹It seems worth while to refer here particularly to an interesting book—Petrarch, *The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, by J. H. Robinson and H. W. Rolfe (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898, 436 pages).

fication is now functional). Then follow Indicative Protases (formal) classified according to the tense used in the protasis (formal). In the same way the Temporal Clauses (functional) are subdivided into clauses introduced by *ubi, quando, ut*, etc. (formal). In a work of this kind one must come ultimately to function, but it is better to apply a formal classification just as far as possible. Professor Bennett's separation of subordinate clauses in the indicative from those in the subjunctive has necessitated also a separation of material that might have been treated under one head. For example, one is forced to examine different chapters to find all the cases of conditional usage, although most of the material could have been grouped in one place if a classification based on introducing particles had been adopted. It is open to question, however, whether the results would have been any better than at present. All systems have their defects.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

Bryn Mawr College.

(To be continued.)

Theocritus in English Literature. By Robert T. Kerlin. Yale Dissertation (1906). Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell Co. (1910). Pp. 203. \$1.50.

This is a unique and thoroughgoing investigation into the influence of Theocritus upon English literature. The author has treated all notices, imitations, comments, translations or paraphrases of Theocritus, from the earliest, in Skelton (1523), down to 1906. It is much more than a mere list that he gives us; the running comment and evaluation makes it very interesting reading. He deals with such topics as pastoral poetry, Theocritus's place in the world's literature, pastoral drama, piscatory and town eclogues, down through the recognized periods of literature in England, and ends with a chapter on Theocritus in America. Appendices, bibliography, and index complete the volume.

Interesting is a quotation (p. 82) from a letter of Anna Seward to Richard Polwhele, Dec. 27, 1785; she says she should as soon "expect a roast phenix for dinner, as that fifty people in this nation would willingly purchase a new translation of writers so little known as either Horace or Theocritus". Until recently, Theocritus has never been widely known, or often translated; Dr. Kerlin gives this summary of translations by centuries (p. 167): "Sixteenth: 1 author, 6 versions [= Idyls]. Seventeenth: 6 authors, 15 versions. Eighteenth: 12 authors, 14 versions. Nineteenth: 19 authors, 49 versions. The numerous translations of passages into sonnets, pictures, etc., occur in the last century". Idyl 19 (Love's Theft of Honey) has been translated oftener than any other, eleven times (yet it probably is not by Theocritus himself); next comes Idyl 11 (The Cyclops in Love), eight times; then Idyl 2 (Simae-

tha's Incantations), six versions. Idyls 15 (The Syracusan Women) and 21 (The Fishermen—non-Theocritean) have five versions each—of course outside of translations of the whole of Theocritus.

Noteworthy are the results from the Victorian era, considering the scant influence Theocritus exercised earlier: "The frequency with which the name of Theocritus occurs in verse during the period, the large number of poems addressed to him, the two prose and the two verse translations, besides numerous partial versions, and the traces of his mode of expression in much of the best poetry of the time, together with the fresh and appreciative essays on his genius, testify that Theocritus has come at last to be a really considerable force in English literature" (p. 139).

Similarly, for America (p. 165): "The younger American singers, whatever their merits, have paid more tributes to Theocritus than to any other ancient poet. . . . There is in much of their verse the lilt of true song, the throb of joy, the melody of self-prompted singing. . . . The best of these have tried to imitate his realism, and to catch his simple graces".

We are grateful that the author has quoted freely from many of the recent verses dedicated to Theocritus by Englishmen and Americans alike. Wilde's Villanelle and Dobson's (1880) are given entire; also Langhorne's Theocritus! Theocritus! what pleasant dreams were thine (1846); Lang's To Theocritus in Winter (1879); Egan's Sonnet (1880); Gosse's The poplars and the ancient elms (1880); McCarthy's Sonnet (to Calverley, 1884); Lewisohn's In Sicily (1906). This bringing together, in this connection, of widely scattered verse, is delightful.

The material here presented ought to be invaluable to the next editor of Theocritus—and an American edition is badly needed. All lovers of Theocritus must be grateful to Dr. Kerlin for this laborious task, so well accomplished. It should serve as an incentive to similar work for other authors; a similar investigation for Catullus would be especially welcome¹.

ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

Ohio State University.

Two books of interest in connection with the teaching of elementary Latin have appeared within this year. The first, entitled Latin for Beginners, is by Professor B. L. D'Ooge, of the State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Michigan, (Ginn & Co.). The other, A Latin Primer, is by H. C. Nutting, Professor in the University of California, (The American Book Company). Professor Nutting plans to publish A First Latin Reader; the Primer and the Reader will together cover First Year Latin. Both books will be reviewed before long in these pages.

¹This book was noticed in The Nation on February 9. In The Nation for April 20, in a brief letter, Mr. Alfred G. Langley, of Newport, calls attention to "the fine paper, Tennyson and Theocritus, in Stedman's Victorian Poets, 6202-233 (edition of 1875)". This essay, says Mr. Langley, shows clearly that Theocritus was known and appreciated in America earlier than Mr. Kerwin maintained.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing-Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

THE NEW PEARSON

Pearson's Essentials of Latin for Beginners (90 cents) has been revised and improved in accordance with the suggestions of many experienced teachers who have used it. All the changes made have been carefully scrutinized by **Dr. Charles Knapp** of Columbia University, the Managing Editor of the **CLASSICAL WEEKLY**.

Further information on request

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

100 Washington Square :: NEW YORK CITY

The Back Volumes of The Classical Weekly

may be secured by writing to

Professor Charles Knapp,
Barnard College,
New York City

A limited number of sets remains.
Price, \$1.00 per volume.

THE LAKE CLASSICAL SERIES

includes distinctive and progressive
textbooks in Latin and Greek

Sight reading is now supplied free in the paper class texts in Latin, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee appointed by the American Philological Association and the requirements of the New York State Regents. Correspondence invited.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 37 East 28th St., New York

The Latin Games

Verb Games—1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, each 29c.

Game of Latin Authors, \$1.04.

Any or all sent postpaid on receipt of price. Stamps accepted.

Let the wide-awake sit down and order at once.

THE LATIN GAME CO., APPLETON, WIS.

College Series of Latin and Greek Authors

These are the Greek and Latin classics best adapted for reading in American colleges and universities, and published in the most excellent form of editing available.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London

A LATIN GRAMMAR

By H. E. BURTON, PH.D., *Professor of Latin, Dartmouth College.* 90 cents

A new grammar and the only one on the market to-day which is sufficiently clear for the beginner and also sufficiently complete and scholarly for the college student. Its live, vigorous quality makes it extremely interesting; its method of showing the relative importance of facts is very effective.

SILVER, BURDET & COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago

Macmillan's Latin Series

Barss's *Nepos: Twenty Lives*90
Bain's *Poems of Ovid* \$1.10
Von Minckwitz's *Cicero* 1.25
Hodge's *Caesar: The Gallic War* 1.25

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO